Remarks

Claims 29-42 are pending in the application.

Claims 29-42 are rejected by the Examiner.

Claims 29-42 are rejected under 35 USC 102(a) as being anticipated by Trehus et al. (US Patent No. 6,963,954).

Trehus describes a prefetch system in which the amount of a prefetch is determined by an address of the data, where the system has knowledge about the type of data that resides are different addresses. See col. 2, lines 44-60, and col. 3, lines 25-33. Examples are given that include control data (col. 3, lines 24-32) and payload data (col. 3, lines 41-53), and descriptor blocks (col. 4. lines 38-40) and packet data (col. 4, lines 46-51).

The example of descriptor data and packet data is merely one implementation of the possible identification of data by the address. Descriptor data and packet data are stored in different address ranges in Trehus. Therefore, if the address of a read is used for a prefetch, the address can assist in determining what type of data, and therefore what length of data, is to be prefetched to assist in increasing the efficiency of the prefetch cycle.

In claims 29, 34, 38 and 42, however, the descriptor blocks are involved in a retrieval of transmit data, analogous to the packet data of Trehus. No interaction between the descriptor data and the packet data occurs in the address-based prefetching of Trehus. The office action refers to two different embodiments of Trehus, one for address-based fetching of control data and payload data, differentiated by their respective addresses in col. 2, and one for address-based fetching of descriptor blocks and packet data, in col. 5. However, while the differences in the respective types of data results in different prefetch lengths, there is no interaction between the descriptor data and the packet data as is claimed in the instant application.

In order to more clearly define the data being fetched, these claims have been amended to clarify that the descriptor blocks are transmitted to the expansion device and the data fetched based upon the descriptor blocks is 'transmit' data. Specifically with regard to claim 29, Trehus does not teach *receiving descriptor blocks including descriptor data at a bridge device*. The office action refers to col. 2, lines 52-60, but that text refers to the prefetch logic determining those parameters based upon the address of the data in the read request that will be fetched, not on descriptor data contained in a descriptor block.

Further, as the prefetch parameters are those determined by the pre-fetch logic, not those contained in the descriptor block, storage of the pre-fetch parameters is not the same as *storing the descriptor data in a memory on the bridge device*.

Trehus does not teach *transmitting the descriptor blocks to the expansion device*. The office action refers to col. 5, lines 40-48, but that text merely discloses that descriptor data prefetches are treated differently than prefetches of packet data.

Further, Trehus does not teach *receiving a read request from the expansion device receiving the descriptor blocks for data associated with the descriptor blocks* because Trehus does not use the descriptor blocks and the transmit data in a same transaction. The text referred to in the office action at col. 2 merely discloses detecting read requests and monitoring addresses associated with the read requests.

It is therefore submitted that amended claim 29 and its dependents are patentably distinguishable over the prior art and allowance of these claims is requested.

As the same reasons with regard to claims 34, 38 and 42 were given as those regarding claim 29, it is submitted that these claims and their dependents are also patentably distinguishable over the prior art and allowance of these claims is requested.

With regard to claim 30, Applicants believe that rejection to be in improper form. If the Examiner is relying upon Berry et al. to teach the hash table, then the rejection would seem to more properly be a rejection under 35 USC 103(a), not 102(e). However, for the reasons cited above, Trehus does not teach all of the elements of the claimed invention under 35 USC 102(e), so the addition of Berry is irrelevant.

No new matter has been added by this amendment. The prior art cited but not relied upon has been reviewed and is not considered pertinent to the Applicant's invention as claimed. Allowance of all claims is requested. The Examiner is encouraged to telephone the undersigned at (503) 222-3613 if it appears that an interview would be helpful in advancing the case.

Customer No. 20575

Respectfully submitted,

MARGER JOHNSON & McCOLLOM, P.C.

Julie L. Reed

Julie L. Reed
Reg. No. 35,349

MARGER JOHNSON & McCOLLOM, P.C.
210 SW Morrison Street
Portland, OR 97204
503-222-3613